

REMARKS

The above amendment is made in response to the Office Action mailed February 9, 2006. Claims 1-4, 6-12, 17-22 are pending in the application. In a conversation with the Examiner on January 23, 2006, claims 1-4, 12, 19, and 21 were elected without traverse and claims 6-11, 17, 18, 20, and 22 were withdrawn. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 12, 19, and 21 stand rejected. The Examiner's reconsideration of the claim rejections is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 12, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berger (U.S. Patent 4,193,035) (hereinafter "Berger"), as set forth on pages 2-4 of the Office Action.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the examiner stated that Berger discloses, "a first mixing portion, element numbers 1a and 1b, which receive a first input signal and a second input signal...", thereby anticipating claims 1 and 12. Amended claim 1, now claims *inter alia* "a first mixing portion which receives a non phase-shifted first input signal and a non phase-shifted second input signal..." Amended claim 12, now claims *inter alia* "multiplying a non phase-shifted first input signal and a non phase-shifted second input signal".


Berger discloses a phase shifting device (FIG. 1, element 4) and "a double sideband signal is mixed with either one of two locally produced radio frequency oscillations which are shifted in phase over 90° relative to one another..." (Column 1, lines 9-12). However, when using a phase shifting device, unless the phase of a signal is

displaced precisely, the image component is not completely removed (See Applicant's Specification, lines 15-17). Since Berger does not disclose a non phase-shifted first input signal and a non phase-shifted second input signal, there is no anticipation of claims 1 and 12.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 12, are believed to be patentably distinguishable over Berger. Claims 2-4, and 19 are believed to be patentable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1. Claim 21 is believed to be patentable at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 12.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

By:



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicants

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889